

unbelief of the Gentiles. But Origen in this passage is merely reproducing the doctrine of Romans 11, not falsifying it for the sake of an artificial antithesis. The error is one of punctuation, and of being misled, so it would seem, by the uncritical punctuation of the original; a speech is ascribed to Israel which Origen in fact put in the mouth of the Church of the Gentiles. The translator might perhaps have suspected that she was misrepresenting Origen, when she made him so crudely misrepresent the Apostle.

EDMUND HILL, O.P.

THE LITTLE BREVIARY. Compiled by T. Stallaert, c.ss.r., tr. by the Benedictine Nuns of Stanbrook. (Burns and Oates; £4.)

This breviary is designed for the use, both private and choral, of lay people and of religious who lack the time or the Latin to recite the full Roman breviary. It is based meticulously on the Roman breviary, but all the offices are radically shortened. Thus Matins consists of just one nocturn, and Sunday Vespers of Psalm 13 divided into five sections. Nearly all the hymns are reduced to three verses only. The lay-out and the directions are thoughtful and thorough, and the technique of using it should not take long to master. It could be quite invaluable in making the riches of the Divine Office available to those who are not bound to its recitation in Latin by strict obligation.

Two further observations may be permitted. Since there is no question here of public ecclesiastical obligation, there would seem to be ample scope for experimenting with this type of shorter breviary. This volume intentionally sticks close to the Roman breviary, and only departs from it by way of abbreviation. But one would like to think that here precisely is the field for controlled liturgical experiment. To take only one example, the choice of Scripture readings for the course of the year, particularly for the weeks after Pentecost; here is a chance, one feels, to try out a more equitable distribution of Scripture passages, and to withdraw from the Machabees their somewhat unmerited usurpation of the whole of October. A very valuable experiment that might be mentioned here is *Le Bréviaire des Fidèles*, by Père Henri, O.P., which it would be good to see translated into English.

Secondly a word about the translation. The Knox version has been used for the psalms and all Scripture passages. Once again one is made to reflect how unfortunate it is that this very personal *tour de force* has been so comparatively hastily thrust into the position of almost our official English version. Here again, surely, there is a good case for experiment, for encouraging a number of Catholic translations, in

order that in due time the authorities might have a wide selection to choose from. Granted that Challoner is no longer really satisfactory, it seems vain to try and stifle the contemporary translation ferment with Knox and again Knox. One can only hope that the wide use of this Little Breviary will not lead to the Knox version being taken more and more for granted by the faithful in England as *the* Catholic version.

EDMUND HILL, O.P.

JESUS AND HIS COMING. By J. A. T. Robinson. (S.C.M. Press; 15s.)

In recent years non-Catholic scholars have been giving much attention to New Testament eschatology: they are concerned to relate the doctrine of the Last Things to the thought of the present day. Many of them, though insisting on the final consummation of all things in Christ, regard the New Testament picture of the End, not as a prediction of events, but as expressing only a conviction of God's ultimate sovereignty in him. The final scenes that are foretold belong to the realm of myth. Dr Robinson accepts this position, but would go further. His especial concern is with the doctrine of Christ's Second Coming; and his aim is to discover, from a critical study of the New Testament and particularly of the Synoptic Gospels, whether as commonly understood it formed part of Jesus's teaching or only emerged as the expectation of the Church. If the latter, how and why did it arise?

His thesis is as follows. Belief in a Second Coming exists clearly developed first in the Thessalonian Epistles, and then in the Synoptics. Yet, he would say, in the preaching of Jesus himself, as criticism lays it bare, in the earliest apostolic preaching and credal statements, and even in the early development of the Gospel themselves, the belief in another coming of Christ in glory does not appear. Christ through his death and resurrection has triumphed, the future is his, all enemies will finally be subdued; but the expectation of his return, as distinct from all this, arose within the Church and was not foretold by him. The predictions ascribed to him in the Gospels are not his own words, but result from this expectation. Jesus was concerned to proclaim the present crisis for the Jewish people, and its approaching culmination in his own death and resurrection. This would be at once his own glorification and their judgment: it would inaugurate his universal kingdom and result in the destruction of the city that had rejected him. All this was the final, the eschatological event; yet the New Testament writers, except perhaps in the fourth Gospel and the later Epistles of St Paul, failed to penetrate the full content of Jesus's teaching, separated out from it what seemed still unrealized, and expressed this, in apocalyptic terms, as a separate future act: he would come again.